

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 311

TM 003 303

TITLE Jefferson Junior High Pocket School and Positive Peer Culture: An Evaluation.

INSTITUTION Minneapolis Public Schools, Minn. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.

REPORT NO C-71-62

PUB DATE Nov 72

NOTE 54p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29

DESCRIPTORS Academic Failure; Behavior Problems; *Core Courses; *Curriculum Evaluation; Curriculum Problems; Experimental Curriculum; Group Counseling; Intermediate Grades; *Junior High Schools; *Peer Groups; Problem Solving; *Program Attitudes; Questionnaires

ABSTRACT

This specialized curriculum at a Minneapolis junior high school was designed for students having considerable academic and behavioral difficulty. The curriculum emphasizes personalized help and team work with peers. The academic part of the program, the Pocket School, emphasizes English, social studies, and math. The second part of the program, the Positive Peer Culture, involves group sessions in which a group leader and a few students meet to discuss students' personal problems and ways of solving them. Questionnaires and interviews were used to obtain information from administrative staff, faculty and students for evaluation of the program. None of the 22 students in the peer group wanted to continue with the group for the coming year. About half wanted to continue with the Pocket School. About 60 percent of the faculty thought that the Pocket School should or could be continued if modifications were made. A similar percentage thought that the peer group could be continued with changes. It was apparent that the leaders and the faculty of the peer group did not share a common philosophy. Evaluators raised questions about the adequacy of training for teachers in the Pocket School and for group leaders. Recommendations, if the program is to continue, include: a written statement of goals; formulations of a common philosophy; appointment of a director for the program; keeping the program entirely at one facility; and complete administrative support for the program. The questionnaires are appended.

(Author/KM)

Minneapolis Public Schools

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Jefferson Junior High Pocket School
and Positive Peer Culture
An Evaluation

Conducted by
Augsburg College Social Science Research Center
for
The Minneapolis Public Schools

Ideas expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Minneapolis Public School Administration nor the Minneapolis School Board.

Research and Evaluation Department
Educational Services Division
807 N. E. Broadway
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413
(612) 348-6140

C-71-62
November 1972

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 083311

03

TM

Minneapolis Public Schools

Jefferson Junior High Pocket School and
Positive Peer Culture-An Evaluation

Summary

Jefferson Junior High School is a 50 year old building serving about 1,100 Minneapolis students from a heterogenous section of the city. The school population is drawn from a highly educated affluent area as well as from a relatively low income area of Minneapolis.

See
pp. 1-3

In the spring of 1971 the principal at Jefferson Junior High proposed a specialized curriculum for students who were having considerable difficulty both academically and behaviorally. This curriculum was to emphasize personalized help to the students as well as team work with peers.

See p. 4

There were two aspects to the program: the academic, which would emphasize basic subjects of English, social studies and math. This aspect of the program was called the Pocket School. The second aspect was called the Positive Peer Culture which involved group sessions in which a small number of students and a group leader met to discuss students' personal problems and ways of solving them. It was hoped that the members of the Positive Peer Culture group would become responsible for each other's behavior through emphasis on "caring."

Students were selected on the basis of teacher recommendations. Involvement in the Pocket School and the Positive Peer Culture was mandatory at first but later changed to a voluntary program.

See
pp. 5-7

The program was implemented in the following year under the directorship of a new principal. This principal requested an evaluation of the program to determine if it was an effective one.

The Augsburg College Social Science Research Center was contracted by the Minneapolis Schools to evaluate the program. Questionnaires and interviews were used to obtain information from administrative staff, faculty, and students.

See
pp. 9, 10

Results showed a number of problems with the program implementation. None of the 22 students in the peer group wanted to continue with the group for the coming year. About half of these students wanted to continue with the Pocket School effort.

See
pp. 12-22

About 60 percent of the faculty felt that the Pocket School should or could be continued if modifications were made. A similar percentage felt that the Positive Peer Culture group could be continued with changes.

Although no formal goals or objectives were written, it appears that there was general agreement among staff and students as to the goals of the project. However, it was apparent that there was not a common philosophy among the leaders and the faculty of the Positive Peer Culture group. The evaluators

raised questions about the adequacy of training for teachers in the Pocket School for this program, as well as the adequacy of the training of those persons leading the groups. Some difficulties in staffing the program were noted.

Recommendations for future operation, if the program is to continue, include (1) a written statement of goals, (2) an attempt to obtain a common philosophy among the faculty and leaders, (3) an appointment of a director with sole responsibility for the operation of the program, (4) maintaining the program either entirely within Jefferson Junior High or entirely at a separate facility, rather than having students in the school for part of their program and at a different facility for another part of the program, and (5) complete administrative support for the program.

See
pp. 24-30

* * *

November 1972

Research and Evaluation Department
Educational Services Division

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Appreciation is expressed to the Jefferson Junior High School students and faculty who cooperated in this effort by completing and returning questionnaires as well as submitting to personal interviews. Thanks also is extended to Jefferson Junior High School Principal Almon Hoyer, Eugene Persha, Director of the Pocket School, John Higginbotham, Director of the Positive Peer Culture, Principal Kenneth Northwick of South High School, and James Swabb, Jefferson Social Worker, for their part in advising and facilitating this inquiry. The diligence of Research Assistant Mrs. Barbara Loudon not only accomplished the project but also made it possible to meet deadline requirements.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Jefferson Junior High - Background & Neighborhood . . .	1
PSPPC Background	4
Instrumentation	8
Goals and Objectives	
Perceptions of Goals and Objectives	
Relationship of PS to PPC	
General Reactions to PSPPC Program	
Recommendations - Internal & External	
Results	11
Goals and Objectives	
Perceptions of Goals and Objectives	
Relationship of PS to PPC	
General Reactions to PSPPC Program	
Internal Recommendations	
External Recommendations	
Analysis of Student Opinion Questionnaire	32
Summary of Findings	39
Appendix	42

Minneapolis Public Schools
Jefferson Junior High Pocket School and
Positive Peer Culture-An Evaluation

Dr. Almon Hoyer, Jefferson Junior High School Principal, in addition to other faculty and administrative personnel at Jefferson, had an interest in learning something of the accomplishments of the Pocket School and Positive Peer Culture group program (PSPPC) which had been carried out at this school during the 1971-72 school year. The Augsburg College Social Science Research Center was retained to carry out the inquiry. It was the intent of the Augsburg evaluation team to assist by presenting evidence regarding possible continuation and/or modifications of the PSPPC.

Jefferson Junior High School-
Background and Neighborhood*

The Pocket School and Positive Peer Culture (PSPPC) program described in this report was initiated in October, 1971, at Jefferson Junior High School, the fourth most affected junior high in Minneapolis, in terms of negative socio-economic influences.

The school district itself serves one of the most heterogeneous areas in the city, with Hennepin Avenue dividing the two extremes; the highly educated-affluent on the west side in the Kenwood area and the poverty

*information in this section furnished to the evaluation team from Almon Hoyer, Eugene Persha and James Swabb.

prone on the east side of the avenue, 20-30 per cent of whom live at the poverty level. According to the 1970 Planning Commission report, there were 534 dependent persons per 1000 for one area of the school neighborhood. The trend remains toward lower incomes, with between one-fifth to one-sixth of the families in the area receiving AFDC assistance.

Jefferson Junior High school was built in 1923, making the physical plant forty-nine years old. Although in fairly good condition, the school facilities remain overcrowded, having been designed for approximately 850 students, now serving about 1100; six per cent of the student population represents minority groups. The school is located on the smallest site for a school in the state of Minnesota, bounded on two sides by one-way streets. Three of the four floors are located above ground, with the one floor below ground providing space for the lunch room, class space, gymnasium, faculty offices, and janitorial services.

Grades seven through nine are departmentalized with seven class periods a day being taught by about sixty teachers, half of whom hold M.A. degrees. The pupil-teacher staff ratio is between 26-30 to 1. Student and teacher turnover is minimal, both being between 5 and 10 per cent.

The teaching and supporting staff breakdown follows:

55-60	teachers (half with M.A. degree)
1	Principal
1	Ass't Principal
3	Counselors
1	Social worker
1	Social worker's aide
1	Nurse's aide
1	Librarian
3	Secretaries
1	Attendance clerk
1	Attendance clerk aide - half time

The area population is moving from family units to a cross-section of singles, young married couples without children, one parent homes, and low income families. Most of this changing population occurs on the east side of Hennepin Avenue. The east side affords a large number of apartment buildings and multiple family rental units. Home ownership is very high in the Kenwood area.

Thirty to forty per cent of the students served by Jefferson Junior High come from broken homes. (The divorce rate in the Kenwood area is 6.48%.) The area ranks second highest in juvenile delinquency, compared to other areas in Minneapolis.

As to pre-conceived or unusual reactions of the community and faculty members to the PSPPC program, there seems to have been a mixture of positive and negative feelings. One person's information stated considerable negative staff and community feeling after the inception of the program. So far as other pro-

grams in the school or community influencing the results of the PSPPC program are concerned, the one mentioned was the YMCA detached worker program. It was not stated what kind or how much of an influence this YMCA program had on the PSPPC.

PSPPC Background

In the spring of 1971, certain Jefferson Junior High School faculty members, including the principal at that time, Kenneth Northwick, devised a plan whereby students who were not experiencing success in the regular school program would be taken aside and scheduled into a special curriculum which would emphasize more personal help and team work by the students themselves. This special curriculum was in two parts; the academic which would emphasize the basic subjects of English, social studies, and mathematics, and the "Positive Peer Culture" (PPC) which would involve group sessions wherein a small number of students and a qualified group leader would meet to discuss students' personal problems and ways of solving them. It was hoped that members of the PPC group would become responsible for each other's behavior through emphasis on "caring." Persons such as Tom Kitto at the Bryant YES Center, and personnel in a Folwell Junior High program meeting needs similar to those of Jefferson

students, were contacted as outside resources.

Dr. Hoyer assumed the principalship at Jefferson at the beginning of the 1971-72 school year. Mr. Eugene Persha became director of the Pocket School (the name given to the academic portion of the program). Alec Homan assumed directorship of the peer culture groups, but on his subsequent appointment to Bryant Junior High School, Jefferson Junior High found itself without a director. John Higginbotham, who had been hired as a school aide, assumed the position.

Teachers were asked to recommend students for the PSPPC program on the basis of past performance at Jefferson. It was assumed that those students in the pocket school would also be participants in the peer groups. It was specified that a teacher would recommend a student on the basis of under-achievement, continual failure on the part of the student to function in the normal classroom and lack of a positive self-image.

Those faculty members who worked with the pocket school were assigned to teach in the PS because they had a lighter teaching load during the regular school day. Those who were assigned to the program were given from the beginning of the school year through October 18, 1971, to plan their pocket school procedures. Their planning time consisted of the hours they were

scheduled to teach in the pocket school (mornings, sometime during first through third hours). Student involvement with the PSPPC program did not start until the 18th of October.

A letter was sent to each participating child's parent(s), briefly explaining the program, and stating that it (PSPPC program) was a "positive attempt to give special attention to individual students who seemed to need something other than a regular school program, not a punishment or a remedial program." The participating student had no choice in attending the pocket school or peer group sessions but was considered part of the PSPPC program if a preponderance of teachers recommended him/her and if his/her parent(s) did not oppose it.

At its inception, approximately thirty students were chosen for the PSPPC program (both pocket school and peer culture groups). The same students participating in the pocket school also participated in the peer group sessions. They were scheduled into regular school classes during fourth and fifth hours. Only left-over meeting space had been set aside for their academic work and group sessions. Therefore, to accommodate the lack of an atmosphere conducive to a learning situation, arrangements were made with nearby Temple Israel for additional space. From that time

on (the date was not available), the PSPPC students met at the Temple, located approximately three blocks from Jefferson, for their PS classes, meeting the first three class periods of the morning and the PPC group sessions meeting the last hour and fifteen minutes of the school afternoon.

The PS faculty's training consisted of its director, Eugene Persha, talking with Tom Kitto, director of Bryant YES Center, visiting Bloomington's Kennedy High School and Olson Junior High School to observe similar programs, and looking at Folwell Junior High School's plans. During the annual Minnesota Education Association (MEA) convention, one day was set aside when the PS faculty met to plan and select PSPPC students. There is no evidence of actual training in "special techniques" or disciplinary methods.

The PPC director was trained (after he was hired for the position) by Dan Cybeski, State Director of Group Studies, and by Alec Homan, Bryant Junior High School. Cybeski had hired three group leaders who worked with the students until January, when John Higginbotham (director) felt their inadequacy and released them, hiring Taz Sumner (YMCA worker) and Lenny Madsen (Higginbotham's fellow student). Sumner and Madsen subsequently received training in group relations from John Higginbotham (director of PPC) and Bob Johnson

(assistant director of Bryant YES Center). Johnson remains the PPC director's immediate supervisor.

Instrumentation

The major objective for the program was stated as "trying to help each student to better prepare himself eventually for the regular school environment as well as for the years ahead."* Questions arose such as whether or not this was the major objective as seen by the majority of the persons involved, or were there other things the PSPPC was trying to accomplish? For example, were the goals and objectives shared by the faculty, administration, staff and students? What was the relationship of the pocket school (PS) to the positive peer culture groups (PPC)? What were the general reactions to the entire PSPPC program? Should it be continued next school year, and if so, what changes, if any, need to take place? Does one part of the PSPPC program (pocket school or peer groups) have more worth than the other?

Goals and Objectives

Formal objectives and goals had never been stated for the PSPPC program. The first concern of the evaluation was to arrive at some presumed goals and objectives. To do this, five persons were contacted who could describe the program in depth. Those contacted

* Letter to Parents 10/15/71

were Eugene Persha, PS Director, Almon Hoyer, Principal at Jefferson Junior High School, James Swabb, school Social Worker, Kenneth Northwick, the previous year's principal, now at South High School, who initiated the program, and Taz Sumner and John Higginbotham, PPC leader and PPC Director, respectively. Alec Homan, Bryant Junior High School, was also contacted as a source of information relating to the PPC group and leadership training. It was hoped that with this wide range of opinions, the evaluators would be able to derive goals and objectives ex post, and an overall idea of what the program was supposed to do. Workbooks (designed by the Minneapolis Public Schools Research and Evaluation Department, and used in some of their evaluations as a means of collecting background material on the program) were given to four of the six contacts. The three returned became the basis for the formulated goals and objectives found in the Results section of this report.

Perception of Goals and Objectives

Two questionnaires, one for faculty and administration/staff, the other for students, were constructed by the evaluation team. Questions referring to operative goals and objectives specified either pocket school (PS) or positive peer culture (PPC), attempting to establish perceptions for both parts of the PSPPC program.

The faculty-administration/staff questionnaire (see Appendix A) was administered to the entire faculty (fifty-five teachers) plus twelve administration/staff. Approximately seventy-five per cent of the persons contacted cooperated by completing and returning the questionnaire. The student questionnaire (see Appendix B) was administered on May 19, 1972, to the twelve PS students in attendance that day and to twenty-two regular classroom students. The regular classroom students were chosen randomly from a class list of eighth and ninth graders at Jefferson Junior High. Some students in the pocket school were also interviewed informally (while walking to the Temple Israel for classes that day) in an attempt to single out attitudes toward the program.

Relationship of PS to PPC

An attempt to assess the pocket school's relationship to the peer group was based on opinions sought in talking with peer leaders, pocket school teachers, and students in the pocket school, in addition to the faculty-administration/staff questionnaire (see Appendix A) and the student questionnaire (see Appendix B).

General Reactions to PSPPC Program

General reactions were registered by the faculty-administration/staff questionnaire (Appendix A) and the student questionnaire (Appendix B).

Recommendations - Internal and External

Through the faculty-administration/staff questionnaire and talking with administrators, faculty and staff of the PSPPC; through the student questionnaire and talking with PSPPC students and regular classroom students; and through personal interviews with Kenneth Northwick and Alec Homan as outside sources, general recommendations were formulated by the internal persons for the PSPPC (pocket school and positive peer culture). With these recommendations, the evaluation team (external source) formulated some specific recommendations which it feels should be made if the program was to survive another year.

Results

Goals and Objectives

The following are operative goals and objectives formulated ex post for the PSPPC Program:

Goals

- (a) Change student attitudes
- (b) Create success in school for students
- (c) Cut down on student skipping
- (d) Keep kids in school

Objectives

- (a) Successful experience for students engrained in failure patterns and repression in normal school setting.
- (b) Modify student attitudes so as to cope with traditional education experiences upon returning to regular classroom.
- (c) Teachers to use freer, closer approach in teaching students, many of whom were behavior problems.

- (d) Sensitize staff to needs of minorities in order to avoid over-reaction on the part of the staff to social differences.

It appears that objective (b) "modify student attitudes so as to cope with traditional education experiences upon returning to regular classroom" was intended to have been the major force for the PSPPC Program. Although only one of the three persons completing and returning a workbook* stated this as an objective, the other two agreed upon mention. "Getting the trouble makers out of the regular classroom" was stated verbally as something that was accomplished by the PSPPC program during its operation, but was never entered as a formalized objective in any of the three workbooks.

Attendance (referencing goal (c) "cut down on skipping") was virtually impossible to determine. The immediate problem was in trying to establish a list of PSPPC students. April 20, 1972, the inception date of the present evaluation, found the attendance clerk's list outdated and not coinciding with that of the PS director. It seemed impossible for the evaluation team to find a complete list of PSPPC students. One part of the problem was transient student population. Students moved or transferred schools, some were suspended, either from regular school or from the PSPPC.

*Workbooks discussed and described on page 9.

The attendance clerk furnished attendance records for those students she had on her PSPPC list. According to state education laws* "excused absence" refers to those in which the child is reported absent by a member of the family on the day or days of the absence, and returns to school after his/her absence with a note from his/her parent explaining the absence. Otherwise, the student is considered "unexcused" or "truant". According to the attendance clerk, some students return to school with notes which contain excuses different from the called-in report. The student may have been truant, but with the note from his/her parent is considered "excused". It is therefore impossible to say whether or not each absence is a legitimate one or a "skipped" day.

Appendix C lists students participating in the PSPPC program at least through April 20, 1972, comparing their attendance in the school year 1970-71 to that of September, 1971 - April 20, 1972.

Perception of Goals and Objectives

Faculty-administration/staff had reasonable ideas of what the PSPPC program was trying to accomplish. As tabulated by the faculty-administration/staff questionnaire, forty-three statements were made by faculty members, congruous with the formulated goals and ob-

*Information obtained from the Attendance Clerk at Jefferson Junior High School, Minneapolis.

jectives listed in the previous section Goals and Objectives. Ten responses made by the administration/staff were congruous with the operative goals and objectives. Faculty and administration/staff added common goals to those already formulated. These were: "change behavioral problems" and "improve learning skills." Chart 1 shows responses according to goal or objective. It should be noted that a few faculty members perceived more than one goal or objective. The number of responses (43) does not equal the number of respondents (40).

One-fourth of the PSPPC students felt that the pocket school (PS) was trying to help kids with learning and behavior problems as well as change their attitudes. Almost half stated that PS was trying to "make us become something that we aren't", "get us away from the other kids", and "trying to put us down"; fairly negative responses.

Over half of the twenty-two students in the regular classroom situation* felt that the pocket school (PS) at Jefferson was trying to help kids with learning and behavior problems, as well as change their attitudes. About a fourth of the regular students thought PS was working only with learning skills. It appears that regular classroom students did not have as negative a

*twenty-two regular classroom students at Jefferson, chosen randomly from the eighth and ninth grades.

CHART 1

<u>Formulated Goals</u>				<u>Commonly Mentioned Goals</u>	
Change Attitudes	Create Success in School	Cut Down on Skipping	Keep Kids in School	Change Behavior Problems	Improve Learning Skills
Faculty Responses (N=40)	8	9	0	3	8
Adminis./ Staff Responses (N=10)	4	1	0	0	5
<u>Formulated Objectives</u>					
Successful experience to students engrained in failure and regression in the normal school setting	Modify attitudes so as to cope with traditional education upon return to the regular classroom	Teachers use freer, closer approach teaching students, many of whom were behavioral problems	Sensitize staff to needs of minorities in order to avoid over-reaction on the part of staff to social differences		
Faculty Responses (N=40)	6	9	8		0
Adminis./ Staff Responses (N=10)	1	1	3		0

reaction to the attempts of the pocket school as the PSPPC students themselves.

In attempting to ascertain what the PPC groups were trying to accomplish, most of the PSPPC students responded, "change attitudes." A third of the group stated "helping kids with behavior problems" as the PPC group's major attempt. A third of the group responded with statements such as "help with our problems," "they say they're trying to care for us, but it's just their job - they need the bread," "get us away from the other kids," and "change your life." Again, many of the PSPPC students displayed negative attitudes.

Of the twenty-two regular classroom students, half felt that the PPC groups at Jefferson were trying to help kids with learning skills, behavior problems and trying to change their attitudes. Approximately a fifth of them felt that PPC only worked with behavior problems.

It seems that overall, students, faculty, and administration/staff had a general idea of what was attempted by the PSPPC program, but that students in the PSPPC were quite negative to those attempts. Responses directed toward "change attitudes" "create success" and help kids with "behavior problems" and "learning problems" can all be assumed a part of the major objective, that of helping students prepare for eventual return to a regular "traditional" school environment.

Relationship of PS to PPC

All students involved in the pocket school (PS) were also involved in the positive peer culture groups (PPC). At the beginning of the PSPPC program, these students were "assigned" without choice. After February, 1972, those students who were newly recommended could choose whether or not to enter the PSPPC program. Teachers in the pocket school frequently filled out "pink" and "blue" slips on the individual students as a means of feedback to the positive peer culture group leaders. (Samples of the two slips are shown in Appendix D. The pink slip portrays "bad" behavior and the blue slip portrays "good" behavior.) These behavior patterns are then discussed in the PPC group sessions, where fellow students will hopefully "get on the backs" of "wrong-doers" and try to promote more "good" behavior patterns.

There seemed a definite lack of a common philosophy between the PS teachers and the PPC leaders in reference to "positive peer pressure." It is the opinion of the evaluators that the dynamic used in the PPC groups cannot be functional for only one hour and fifteen minutes a day, be virtually defunct the remaining twenty-two hours and forty-five minutes, and still be expected to have a considerable effect. Leaders suggested peer training for PS teachers as a means of strengthening the dynamic of peer pressure and as a means of "wedding"

or drawing a closer relationship between the two portions of the PSPPC program. This is a valid suggestion, but the probability of its happening is questionable. With peer pressure being such a sensitive dynamic, it would seem that these PS teachers would need a considerable amount of training. In fact, the evaluation team does not sufficiently understand the intended "peer pressure" dynamic to determine whether or not the PPC (positive peer culture) leaders themselves had sufficient training or were well enough qualified to employ this dynamic with students.

General Reactions to PSPPC Program

Although those faculty, staff and students directly involved in the PSPPC program have the first hand information as to what has been happening, the general empathy of the remaining faculty, administration/staff and students at Jefferson Junior High is necessary for a workable program. Any program involving students and faculty depends on such support. In an attempt to register reactions to the PSPPC program, one question in the faculty-administration/staff questionnaire referred to the worth of the pocket school, and another to the worth of the positive peer culture groups.

Reaction to the PS:

Of the forty faculty respondents, fifteen thought the pocket school (PS) was worthwhile, twenty-one thought it was not worthwhile, and eleven stated they

didn't know or weren't sure. Seven respondents gave both pro and con reactions (number of responses = 47).

Nine of the ten administration/staff respondents saw worth in the PS, whereas only two responded negatively and two didn't know. Here again, three respondents gave both pro and con reactions to the question of worth.

The faculty-administration/staff named the following as major reasons for the PS's worth:

- smaller classes, personalized help, and individual attention - helpful toward achievement
- getting the behavior problems out of the regular classroom, "thereby other students have been set free to learn, not just tolerate"

The faculty-administration/staff named the following as major reasons for the PS's lack of worth:

- deals only with discipline, reinforcing bad habits
- waste of time and money" - no positive change
- it segregates students and the opposite should be true
- poor leadership
- severe behavioral disturbances and lack of "self-discipline."

In response to the question "Do you think the program has helped anybody this year?" (student questionnaire) about half of the twelve PSPPC students said yes and about half responded no. About thirty-five per cent of the twenty-two regular classroom students didn't know if the program had helped anybody. Twenty-five per cent thought the program had helped people and thirty-five per cent of the regular students thought the program had helped "some" students.

When asked if they would like to take part in the pocket school (PS) next year, if they would not have to participate in the peer culture groups (PPC) over half of the twenty-two regular classroom students said no, and only two said yes. When asked the same question concerning participation in pocket school (PS) without participating in peer groups (PPC) for next year, about half of the twelve PSPPC students thought they would like to (2 stipulated "without Mr. Persha") and one third said no. One-fourth of the twelve PSPPC students didn't know if they would like to be involved again. PSPPC students went on to say that the best part of the pocket school (PS) was "being in Mr. Jone's room," "game day on Friday," "being around group members," "short classes" and "when you know what you're doing and everybody's listening."

When asked whether or not, in their opinion, the PS classes are easier, harder, or about the same as regular classes in school, over half (12) of the twenty-two regular classroom students said "easier," and about one-fourth (6) said "don't know." Three students thought PS classes were "harder" or "the same." Half (6) of the PSPPC students thought their PS classes were easier than regular classes. No one thought they were harder, but two PSPPC students responded "easier work but harder to get along with teachers."

Reaction to PPC:

Of the forty faculty respondents, thirty-eight per cent (15) said that the positive peer culture (PPC) was worthwhile, thirty-five per cent (14) said that they were not worthwhile, and twenty-seven per cent (12) said they didn't know or weren't sure. One person registered pro and con responses for the same question (number of responses = 41).

Half (5) of the ten administration/staff respondents felt the PPC was worthwhile, while only two persons responded negatively to its worth and three weren't sure because they had "not seen any of their results."

The faculty-administration/staff named the following major reasons for the PPC's worth:

- may be an answer for causing more positive thinking.
- have seen some positive changes; at least an attempt is being made to improve
- groups attempt to handle serious problems, changing student attitudes and values toward positive thinking and feelings

The faculty-administration/staff named the following major reasons for the PPC's lack of worth:

- lack of qualified leaders (poorly trained and lack of experience)
- have seen absolutely no improvement
- "I was told at the beginning of the year that my students involved in the positive peer groups would become good students within three weeks. While I didn't expect this to happen, I did hope to see some improvement. I saw none."
- bad habits being reinforced.

When asked in the student questionnaire whether or not they would like to participate in the peer groups

(PPC) if they did not have to be part of the pocket school (PS), over fifty per cent (12) of the twenty-two regular classroom students said no and only one-fifth said yes. One-hundred per cent, all twelve of the PSPPC students (responding to the student questionnaire) said they did not want to participate in the PPC groups next year. They did, however, state some good points about the group sessions (PPC) including things such as "getting out early," "getting out for a free day," "having fun - going places like swimming," and "if you can help somebody."

It appears that if the PSPPC program could meet a number of modifications by next school year, the majority of faculty, administration and staff would consider it workable. Thirty-one of fifty felt that the PS (pocket school) should or could be continued if changes were made. Twelve were against continuation and seven did not respond. Thirty of fifty felt that the PPC (positive peer culture) could or should be continued if changes were made. Twelve were against continuation and eight did not respond. The necessary modifications, formulated by the faculty, administration and staff can be found in the following section.

All the PSPPC students were against continuation for next year in the PPC (positive peer culture group) portion of the PSPPC program. About half were for continuation of PS (Pocket School) and about half of the

PSPPC students were against it. Regular school students were basically not interested in being part of either the PS or PPC, but were not against its continuation for the benefit of other students.

Internal Recommendations

The following is a list of changes for the PSPPC program, formulated by the faculty-administration/staff and students. They have been listed separately, according to recommendations for the pocket school (PS) and recommendations for the positive peer culture groups (PPC). As can be seen, recommendations are not in accord as to philosophy and ways of handling the PSPPC program.

Pocket School Recommendations

Faculty Formulated

1. all PS teachers should agree on the same philosophy
 - honest, consistent commitment to students as people
 - better teacher and leader interrelationship
2. better communication between teachers and leaders
3. qualified teachers only (better trained personnel)
4. teachers freed from regular school curricula responsibilities
 - common prep time for faculty of pocket school
 - more prep time
 - weekly or bi-weekly conferences - feedback to teachers involved
5. more freedom for pocket teachers to make decisions regarding discipline
 - strong, immediate punishment for rule infractions
 - more rigid rules and regulations - more regimented schedule
6. more support from all Jefferson personnel
7. add good students to reinforce good behavior
8. better building facilities - on school ground as opposed to "off campus" at Temple Israel

9. keep PS away from regular school - far away
-supervision en route to Temple Israel
10. aide for secretarial work
11. work through and with regular classes -
special tutor sessions

Administration/staff Formulated

1. complete re-organization
-better planning (pre)
2. qualified teacher only (better trained personnel)
3. add good students to reinforce good behavior
4. alternatives for when standard procedures
don't work
5. better criteria for selecting more candidates

PSPPC Students Formulated

1. let kids work at their own ability - otherwise
they're just getting behind
2. change Mr. Persha's attitude*
3. get Mr. Persha out of the whole program*
4. change PPC group
5. free hour for all PSPPC students to talk together

Positive Peer Culture Recommendations

Faculty Formulated

1. qualified staff - more stable leadership
-need better example set for them from the
leaders (leaders have a rather "hippy, seedy"
look about them - underachievers)
-qualified, positive leaders who command
respect (not high school "drop outs")
2. could an outright psychologist fare better?
3. better communications between teachers and
leaders
4. more space, not to be moved around
-should be removed from regular school and
should run all day or have a 24 hr/day con-
trolled environment
-should not become so separated that they lose
contact with normal school operations
5. promptness and attendance in the group should
be a firm requirement
6. better coordination of disciplinary policies
-a way of holding kids accountable and specific
consequences followed
7. more support and cooperation from administration
8. not familiar enough to comment (9 responses)

*It should be noted that Mr. Persha is not only one of the pocket school teachers but also is the Director, therefore assumes the role of accountability and could possibly, for this reason, exert more pressure and be the source of punishment.

Administration/Staff Formulated

1. complete re-organization
-better planning (pre)
2. highly educated, qualified, trained leaders
3. more heterogeneous grouping
-reinforcing negative behavior with early dismissals should stop
4. better criteria for selecting more candidates
5. more cooperation from administration

PSPPC Students Formulated

1. sometimes PPC group isn't fair
2. meet for a shorter time
3. should be more serious
4. a person should be asked if you want to go to it
5. take out the people that don't want the help and accept it and get some people in that will take the help
6. let us know that we do good things, not all bad things

External Recommendations

The evaluation team has formulated its own list of recommendations, based on its observations and also on personal interviews and opinions frequently registered in the questionnaires. Some of the following can be labeled "obvious" modifications and seem quite general, but it must be noted that external observers see primarily the general workings of the program. More specific, internal recommendations from the Pocket School Director and Positive Peer Culture Director would be considered most beneficial.

The following are the recommendations formulated by the evaluation team:

PRE-PLANNING AND ORGANIZATION

Goals and Objectives -

Stated and formally written, setting limits to the program in terms of viable accomplishments.

Population -

What formal selection criteria are necessary in order to find students who show most promise of benefitting from the program? Preventative measures with seventh graders known to be heading for disaster might be more beneficial than waiting till the child has become engrained in failure, bad attitudes and behavior problems and then trying to aid him in eighth and ninth grades. The PSPPC program at this time tends to have a homogeneous grouping of behavior problems, "bad kids." It would seem beneficial to create a heterogeneous grouping, adding students with "good" behavior patterns. This may not be possible, however, in lieu of the recommendation and selection criteria already set up for the PSPPC program's population.

Faculty/Staff -

PSPPC faculty and staff should have a common philosophy which would include a common desire to help the kind of student the program seeks to work with and a common means of working with

the students (technique). Teachers should not be assigned to the task, but the selection of faculty should be from a number of volunteers.

Director -

A single PSPPC Director should be accountable for the entire PSPPC program, in charge of scheduling, selection of PSPPC personnel, selection and discipline of PSPPC students, communication between all factions of PSPPC (pocket school and peer culture groups) and also between the PSPPC program and the remaining Jefferson Junior High School faculty, administration/staff and students. All PSPPC personnel and PSPPC students would answer to the director, who in turn would answer to the principal of Jefferson or the principle administrator of such programs, whichever would be required. The Director should be sufficiently removed from the program to facilitate administrative needs without becoming completely removed from the substance of the program.

Organization of curricula and class scheduling -

Pocket School -

Faculty working in this program should have a common preparation time corresponding to the number of hours spent in the PS classroom.

Faculty should also be a stable group, that is, scheduled to teach in the PS first and second semester. If necessary, faculty for the PS should be scheduled out of any regular school involvement, giving full attention to the PS.

Positive Peer Culture -

PPC groups should be scheduled into the day and remain constant to that time. PPC leadership should remain stable, that is, the same leaders should be available to work with their same groups all year long. NO change of leadership should take place once the program has started, if possible. Stability seems to be something these students are lacking.

Facilities -

The PSPPC program should either remain entirely removed from the Jefferson Junior High School grounds for the entire day, or remain a part of the school for the entire day. Being carted back and forth to the Temple Israel for parts of the day is conducive to nothing, other than creating a chance for skipping school to students who lack self-discipline in the first place. This way, the students in the PSPPC don't belong to either group, the PSPPC program or the regular Jefferson Junior High School program.

Training - Faculty and Staff

Steps should be taken, prior to the inception of the program giving teachers and leaders special and qualified training in any dynamic that is to be used with the student. PPC leaders should not be hired to work with students unless they have had prior training in group relationships.

Aides -

Secretarial help would be beneficial in order to relieve the PS faculty of the paperwork needed in order to keep base line data, perfect attendance records, tardiness, etc.

Another necessary person would be a counselor for the program, one who would work directly with the PSPPC faculty/staff and PSPPC students. Some students have PS teachers, PPC leaders, a counselor, a social worker, and possibly a member of administration, all trying to help, but at times being pitted against one another. This "pitting against" is usually done by the student himself, very effectively and to great advantage. With one counselor, part of this problem could be avoided. The PSPPC could also use its counselor in selecting students that have been recommended by Jefferson teachers, establishing whether or not the child recommended would

actually benefit by the program. In the PSPPC program, the PS faculty has in the past been given this job.

Support -

There must be a total commitment on the part of the administration first and foremost, to see that the program survives in the most productive manner. Without this support, any program will fail. Usually, when the administration supports a program, the faculty and staff will follow. One of the most necessary means of gaining support for the PSPPC program would be reports to the entire Jefferson faculty, administration and staff, keeping everyone informed and communications open. Students as well should know what is going on. Keeping secretive information is one of the best ways to start false rumors and jealousies - one of the big downfalls of the PSPPC program, causing much antagonism.

Communication -

If the leaders of PPC cannot or do not communicate with the teachers of PS, the "wedding" of the two portions of the PSPPC program has failed. PPC leaders should give feedback to PS teachers as well as vice versa.

Reporting of behavior patterns through the pink

and blue slips (Appendix D) is a good one if done consistently. There should also be an open channel of correspondence with the remaining faculty, administration/staff.

Pre and Post Testing -

Some means of verifying improvement in learning skills (if this is to be a goal of the program) and behavior modifications should be formulated before the program begins. The SOQ questionnaire might be useful as a measure of attitudinal changes - but only if the questionnaire can be administered to the PSPPC students pre and post.

Analysis of Student Opinion Questionnaires

The Student Opinion Questionnaire (SOQ) prepared and administered to all Jefferson students through the Research and Evaluation Department of the Minneapolis Public School System were tabulated separately for children in the PSPPC program. (The SOQ was developed to measure student attitudes toward a number of aspects of school.) Eighteen PSPPC students responded to the 93 - item instrument on the day it was administered, early in May, 1972. However, five children did not enter their names on the forms and were lost from the tabulation. The summary is therefore based on the remaining 13 who were identifiable.

Five of the thirteen were boys; eight were girls. Two were non-whites. Due to sketchy records and shifting enrollments it was not possible to determine how closely the sample approximated the overall PSPPC enrollment on the two variables. Students from grades 7, 8 and 9 were represented with six students in the eighth grade.

Six of the group saw themselves as receiving "average" grades in school while two indicated they performed "excellent" work and one indicated "above average" work. Two rated their grades as "below average" and one marked his grades as "very low."

From the results of the questionnaire, only a general

indication of students' attitudes is possible. This comparative summary reports how students responded to the questionnaire. Why they responded the way they did and why their responses may differ from other students can best be interpreted by PSPPC staff and faculty with their knowledge of students and conditions in the PSPPC program.

The 93 items in the questionnaire are divided into factors. For purposes of comparison, responses of the 13 PSPPC students were examined in terms of their relationship with responses to the SOQ results of 1971, since 1972 tabulations were not available at the time of this summary. Although there was a range of respondents in the PSPPC group from 7th to 9th grades, average results for all students in the eighth grade in Minneapolis junior high schools employing the SOQ in the previous year were used for comparative purposes.

The reader should remind himself of the highly unstable percentage base afforded by the 13 cases tabulated and compared with all school results.

(1) Liking of School

A very high proportion of students indicated classes are boring and that they don't like school work. All of the 13 PSPPC students stated they like to stay out of school, but a surprisingly low number (15%) indicated they would like to quit school. The feeling of pride for Jefferson is particularly low for the group. The

comparison is 15% to an average of 60% of the 1851 eighth graders on the SOQ in 1971.

(2) Unfair Punishment

Although a very small group of PSPPC students (15% compared to 40%) indicated they receive punishment without cause, most of them (92% compared to 66%) also feel they are sometimes blamed for other students' activities. All the respondents indicate that teachers yell at them (compared to 3/4 of others) and 77% of the PSPPC students say they have been punished in front of other students (comparison, 50%).

(3) Individual Learning

Only 23% of the PSPPC students indicated the PS (pocket school) provided help when they needed it. This is less than half of the comparative figure (54%) for the previous year's eighth graders. However, a high percentage (62%) indicated the school gives them a chance to develop their skills and talents, compared with 42% of all eighth graders the previous year.

(4) Fun of Learning

The percentage of PSPPC students liking their classes was very comparable to other schools (38% compared to 34%). However, a much smaller percentage indicated they enjoyed learning new things (54% compared to 85%) and only 8% found the teachers to be fun and exciting (general comparison, 35%).

(5) Fear of Asking Questions

PSPPC students generally felt they could ask for help or could ask questions. Only 15% indicated they were afraid to ask questions (comparison, 35%) and 85% of the PSPPC students (comparison, 69%) stated they were not afraid to ask for needed help.

(6) Involvement in Decision Making

A comparatively lower percentage of PSPPC students felt they're generally involved in class decisions (38% compared to 51%). However, 54% of the PSPPC students, compared to 53% indicated they "sometimes helped decide what the class does."

(7) Dehumanization

In all factor seven questions, PSPPC respondents felt a significantly greater degree of dehumanization than eighth graders of the previous year. 54% (compared to 27%) felt their teachers didn't treat them like human beings, and only 15% (compared to 50%) felt their teachers understand them.

(8) Positive Reinforcement

A comparatively lower percentage of PSPPC students feel they receive positive reinforcement for their efforts. Over half feel the people in school don't appreciate their efforts. This compares to 37% of the eighth graders responding the previous year. Only 15% indicated that people in their school try to make them feel important (comparison, 29%).

(9) Encouragement for Independent Thought and Action

77% of the PSPPC students felt they were encouraged to say what they really think in class discussion. This compares to 53% of the responding eighth graders the previous year. However, the percentages for other independence items was generally lower in PSPPC students. Only 38% felt they were encouraged to think for themselves, compared to 66% of the previous year's eighth graders.

(10) Interest in Learning

Approximately one-third of the PSPPC students at Jefferson stated they didn't care whether they learned anything or not, and they were just wanting to pass. The percentage the previous year was considerably lower.

(11) Peer Relations

Percentages for factor eleven items agreed more closely with eighth graders from the previous year than any other factor. 92% of all students - PSPPC and previous year's eighth graders - had some good friends in school. The percentages indicating kids being stuck-up (85% of the PSPPC students compared to 63%) and for school being a lonely place (54% of the PSPPC students compared to 31%) were the only questions with any apparent appreciable difference on this five-item factor.

(12) Concept of Self as Learner

Factor 12 includes the concepts of self as a learner

as well as the self as student. PSPPC students were comparable to the general sample in all questions on learning. However, the PSPPC sample of students saw themselves as not good in school work (77% compared to 31% of the eighth graders from the previous year) and having less success as students (45% PSPPC response compared to 62%).

(13) Teacher Quality

The PSPPC responses indicated only 8% of the students feel the teachers know how to teach and enjoy teaching. Over half of the eighth grade students from the previous year answered these questions affirmatively. However, 69% of the PSPPC students thought the lectures were worthwhile, compared to 43% of last year's students.

(14) Curriculum Relevance

Fewer PSPPC students rated school subjects as relevant (31% compared to 49% of last year's eighth graders). Likewise, only 39% of the PSPPC students at Jefferson found school subjects applicable to outside life (compared to 69% of last year's eighth graders). Over 50% of the PSPPC students stated school was not very helpful to kids not going to college (compared to 38% of last year's respondents).

(15) Perception of Progress in Learning

A comparatively high percentage of PSPPC students indicated they are not learning much in school (61% PSPPC students compared to 30% of last year's students). Less than one-fourth of the PSPPC students stated they had

learned more this year than last, compared to over half of the eighth graders responding last year.

(16) Racial Attitudes

Majority responses, with the exception of two items, suggest a generally positive attitude of PSPPC students toward those of other races. The area of racial attitudes was included in the 1972, SOQ for the first time, and consisted of the following eight items:

	% and # in Agreement
I would like to have more friends of other races	62% (8)
The presence of different races in the same school hinders learning	23% (3)
It is difficult to make friends with students of other races	23% (3)
I consider getting to know students of other races as part of my education	31% (4)
I wish there were more students of other races in this school	54% (7)
I am afraid of students of other races	8% (1)
I think it is a good idea to have students of different races go to the same school	45% (6)
I have some friends of other races in this school	92% (12)

Summary of Findings

The basic problem of the PSPPC program was lack of organization and planning. The PSPPC program was planned for the 1971 -'72 school year, but was not scheduled into the school day, nor had teachers been specifically scheduled to teach in the PS portion of the PSPPC program. Leaders were hired for the PPC (positive peer culture) portion of the program and then trained. The evaluation team knows little about the "peer pressure" dynamic, but assumes a definite need for qualified, intensive training in the technique.

Students were to be recommended for the PSPPC program on the basis of underachievement, lack of positive self-image, and inability to function in the normal classroom environment. It was found, however, that many teachers neglected these criteria and recommended on past performances of bad behavior. This was most conducive to a homogeneous grouping of "bad kids" reinforcing "bad behavior" patterns.

Considering the inability of the investigators to identify goals and objectives formalized prior to the inception of the PSPPC program, there seemed to be a reasonably good understanding by the faculty and administration/staff of the somewhat differentiated goals and objectives. (See chart 1) It is advisable, however, for PSPPC program planners to set goals and objectives,

limiting the program as to its intended accomplishments then striving for accomplishment of these original items.

It appears that if the PSPPC program could meet a number of modifications by next year, the majority of faculty, administration and staff would consider it workable. Thirty-one of fifty felt that the PS (pocket school) could be continued if changes were made. Thirty of fifty felt that the PPC (positive peer culture) could be continued if changes were made.

All PSPPC students were against participation in the PPC (positive peer culture) portion of the PSPPC program for next year. They were neutral when referencing participation in the PS (pocket school). Half said they would participate next year, and half said they would not. Regular school students were basically not interested in participating in either the PS or the PPC, but were not against its continuation for the benefit of other students.

The Student Opinion Questionnaire (SOQ) prepared and administered through the Research and Evaluation Department of the Minneapolis Public School System, was used to register PSPPC students' attitudes compared to those students who were in regular classroom environments in the previous school year. PSPPC students tended to differ from the 8th graders with whom they were compared in that the PSPPC students:

1. Felt classes were boring.
2. Didn't like school work.

(con't)

3. Would like to stay out of school, but would not care to quit school.
4. Had little pride in Jefferson.
5. Felt they are sometimes blamed for other students' activities.
6. Did not feel the PS provided help when needed,
7. yet they feel the PS did give them a chance to develop their skills and talents,
8. but at the same time did not admit enjoying or learning new things,
9. and did not find teachers to be fun and exciting.

A P P E N D I C E S

APPENDIX A

FACULTY, ADMINISTRATION AND STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

With each of the following questions, please write a brief comment which best describes how you feel. Please feel free to use the back side of the paper to continue any answer which requires more space.

1. Were you involved with the pocket school or the positive peer groups this year (1971 - '72)? Yes____ No____ If yes, in what way?
2. What do you feel the pocket school is trying to accomplish with its students?
3. What do you feel the peer groups are trying to accomplish with their students?
4. What criteria did you use in recommending students for the pocket school and peer culture program?
5. Do you feel that the pocket school is worthwhile?
Yes____ Why?

No ____ Why not?

Don't know____
6. Do you feel that the positive peer groups are worthwhile?
Yes____ Why?

No ____ Why not?

Don't know____

7. What changes, if any, need to take place in the pocket school before you would consider the program "workable"?
8. What changes, if any, need to take place in the peer groups before you would consider the program "workable"?
9. Do you feel that the pocket school should be continued next year?

Do you feel that the peer groups should be continued next year?
10. Are there some students whom you feel should be in the program who are not? Why?
11. Are there some students whom you feel should not be in the program but who are? Why?
12. What does "positive peer pressure" mean to you?

How can "positive peer pressure" best be obtained?
13. If there would be a continuation of the pocket school and peer group program next year, would you be willing to participate as part of the pocket school faculty or as a peer group leader? Please explain. (Do not think that this in any way implicates you for next year - merely express an opinion.)

APPENDIX B

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is for Jefferson Junior High students only. Its main purpose is to learn how students feel toward the Pocket School and Peer Group Sessions. We need this information to decide what would be best for the school next year - continuing the pocket school and group sessions or not to continue them.

For the following questions, please circle the letter in front of the answer which best describes how you truly feel. Your answers are held in confidence - no one will know what you, as a person, say.

Thank you!

Grade in school _____ 7th
this year _____ 8th
(Check one please.) _____ 9th

1. A person can learn more by working four years than by going to school.
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Don't know
2. School learning helps a person get a better job.
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Don't know
3. Jefferson Junior High courses are useless.
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Don't know
4. I go to school because I am forced to.
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Don't know
5. I do not like school teachers so I do not like school.
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c.. Don't know

(Please con't)

6. Has any one person helped you with a problem or given you some good advice this year?
- a. Parent
 - b. Teacher
 - c. Friend
 - d. No one
 - e. Other _____
7. Do you think teachers pay much attention to how students feel about things?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Sometimes
 - d. Don't know
8. Do you think students pay much attention to how teachers feel about things?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Sometimes
 - d. Don't know
9. Do you think kids who are far behind in their learning should have special help in school?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Don't know
10. Do you think "bad kids" in school should have more help or be punished?
- a. More help
 - b. Punished
 - c. Don't know
11. What do you think they are trying to do in the pocket school at Jefferson?
- a. Help kids with learning skills.
 - b. Help kids with behavior problems.
 - c. Change attitudes.
 - d. All of the above.
 - e. Other _____
12. What do you think they are trying to do in the group sessions at Jefferson?
- a. Help kids with learning skills.
 - b. Help kids with behavior problems.
 - c. Change attitudes.
 - d. All of the above.
 - e. Other _____

13. Who do you think the pocket school and group sessions are good for?
- a. All kids
 - b. "Bad kids"
 - c. Kids who need help with school work
 - d. "Good kids"
 - e. No kids
 - f. Other (who) _____
14. Do you think the program has helped anybody this year?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Some
 - d. Don't know
15. Would you like to be in the pocket school next year if you did not have to take part in the group sessions?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Don't know
16. Would you like to be in the group sessions next year if you did not have to take part in the pocket school?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Don't know
17. Do you think that students who were chosen for the program this year are:
- a. "Bad kids"
 - b. Kids who don't know much
 - c. "Good kids"
 - d. Kids who need help with school work
 - e. All of the above
 - f. Other _____
18. Do you think that students have much say about what goes on around Jefferson Junior High School?
- a. A lot to say
 - b. Some say
 - c. Very little say
 - d. No say at all
19. Do you think that students at Jefferson should have a say in what goes on in and around the school?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Don't know

20. Do you think the pocket school classes are easier, harder or about the same as regular classes in school?
- a. Easier
 - b. Harder
 - c. The same
 - d. Don't know

IF YOU ARE IN THE POCKET SCHOOL AND GROUP SESSIONS, PLEASE CONTINUE:
IF NOT, THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION. YOU MAY TURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IN NOW.

21. What is the best part about your peer group sessions?
22. What is the best part about pocket school?
23. What needs to be changed in pocket school?
24. What needs to be changed in the group sessions?
25. What kinds of things did you talk about in your group sessions?
26. Do you like you teachers more, less, or about the same as last year?
- a. More
 - b. Less
 - c. About the same
 - d. Don't know
27. Do you like you peer group leaders?
- a. A lot
 - b. Somewhat
 - c. Not at all
 - d. Don't know

(Please con't)

28. Do you feel that you must take the punishment with your friend when he does something wrong?

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. Sometimes
- d. Not at all

29. Do you think students and teachers labeled the pocket school as a special group?

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. Don't know

If yes, what did they label your group as, and why?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION. YOU MAY TURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN NOW, UNLESS THERE IS SOMETHING MORE YOU HAVE TO SAY. PLEASE FEEL FREE TO WRITE AN ADDITIONAL COMMENT HERE:

APPENDIX C

Students - 1970-1971 Attendance Record

Name	Grade	Total Absence	Unexcused Absence	Days Suspended
A	8	60½	13	4½
B	8	20½	5½	1
C	7	68	22½	0
D	8	17½	12	4½
E	8	21	5	0
F	7	46½	24½	11
G	8	20	2	0
H	7	3	0	0
I	8	55	1	2
J	7	24	10	0
K	7	27	5	4
L	7	27	1	15
M	8	13	2	0
N	7	6	4	0
O	7	47	7	8
P	7	14	4½	2
Q	8	38½	23½	

Students involved in PSPPC - 1971-4/20/72 Attendance Record

Name	Grade	Total Absence	Unexcused Absence	Days Suspended
A	9	48	15	2
B	9	12½	0	1½
C	8	12½	0	1½
D	9	6	0	5
E	9	7½	2½	2
F	8	84	34	(truant 4th & 5th hour all sem)
G	9	34½	4	0
H	8	8	2	1
I	9	25	4	1
J	8	4½	0	1
K	8	20½	3	2
L	8	20	3	8
M	9	6½	1	0
N	8	12½	6	0
O	8	26	0	1
P	8	23½	18	4
Q*	9	21	4	

*Was taken out of the PSPPC program because of improvement in attitude and work.

APPENDIX D

Pocket School Behavior Reports

"Blue Slip"

Name _____	Date _____
Location _____	Time 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 Volunteered help _____	9 Cooperated in routine class procedures _____
2 Accepted help _____	
3 Requested help _____	10 Completed assignments _____
4 Controlled anger _____	11 Attempted new activity _____
5 Was considerate _____	12 Self controlled in unsupervised areas _____
6 Showed initiative _____	13 Worked well independently _____
7 Accepted staff directives _____	
8 Class participation _____	
Additional Comments _____	
Teacher _____	

"Pink Slip"

Name _____	Date _____
Location _____	Time 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 Authority _____	9 Considerate (self) _____
2 Aggravated _____	10 Considerate (others) _____
3 Casing _____	11 Skipping class _____
4 Misled _____	12 Tardy to Class _____
5 Misleads _____	13 Communication (Sdt) _____
6 Bad Mouth _____	14 Communication (Tchr) _____
7 Fighting _____	15 Resists new activities _____
8 Lying _____	16 Light Fingering _____
	17 Plays the fool _____
Additional comments: _____	

101	Teacher _____